

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

BRIDGET Y. TAYLOR,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 2:07cv404-MHT
	)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

**ORDER ON MOTION**

On March 17, 2008, Petitioner filed a pleading styled as a “Motion to Compel” (Doc. No. 14). The court construes this pleading to be a motion to expedite ruling. Upon consideration of this motion, it is

ORDERED that the motion to expedite ruling (Doc. No. 18) is DENIED.

The court is mindful that Petitioner filed her 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion in May 2007. However, the court’s caseload of actions pending pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 makes it extremely difficult to expedite resolution of Petitioner’s motion, particularly since the court has adopted a policy of disposing of cases on the basis of the length of pendency. The court assures the parties that a determination of the issues presented in this case will be undertaken in due course.

Done this 21<sup>st</sup> day of March, 2008.

/s/Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE